

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/005,052	12/04/2001	Adelmo Monsalve-Gonzalez	5553	9205	
30173 7	7590 09/07/2005		EXAMINER		
GENERAL MILLS, INC.			TRAN LIEN, THUY		
P.O. BOX 1113 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440			ART UNIT PAPER NUM		
			1761		
			DATE MAILED: 09/07/200	DATE MAILED: 09/07/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		W		
Application No.	Applicant(s)			
10/005,052	MONSALVE-GONZA	MONSALVE-GONZALEZ ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit			
Lien T. Tran	1761			

Advisory Action	10/005,052 MONSALVE-GONZALEZ ET AL.					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Lien T. Tran	1761				
The MAILING DATE of this communication and	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	lross			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 19 August 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
 a) Ye period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO 						
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for						
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))	corresponding number of finally re		,			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proposed. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		vill be entered and an	explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-48</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			•			
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good at and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.						
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•				
 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s), 						
13. Other:		LIEN TRAN				
		PRIMARY EXAMIN				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the argument is not persuasive for reason of record. Additionally, applicant argues the ozone treatment step in the World publication is a post treatment step and the vanillin is oxidized by the first bleaching treatment so that it is not possible to have an increase in vanillin. This argument is not persuasive because the claims do not exclude other steps cited in the World publication. As to the vanillin, the publication discloses that the treatment at high pH causes the ferulic acid to become more available. Vanillin as disclosed is formed from the reaction of ferulic acid and ozone. Thus, if more ferulic acid become available, then the ferulic acid will react with the ozone in the ozone treatment step to form vanillin; this cause a reduction in the ferulic acid and an increase in vanillin. The vanillic acids referred to in the publication is a natural product while the claimed vanillin is a reaction product. Since the referene teaches the same reaction, it is inherent the same reaction product will form.